

Clarifications and/or Corrections

Re: Appeal Submissions of Nicholas Ali

Point 10. i.: The Dean of the FGPS did not make a substantive evaluation of the thesis; neither did the Executive Committee of the FGPS.

Point 10. iii.: The “defamatory communication” referred to here is presumably Dr. Lamontagne’s e-mail regarding Mr. Ali’s posting on the biomechanics listserv. This e-mail, received on 3 May 2013, was not deemed relevant to the appeal. There is nothing defamatory in this email. It simply reported the fact that Mr. Ali had made his appeal public.

Point 10. iv. v. vi. Page 4: « SHK » should be replaced by « FGPS ».

Point 21. : The word “further” on the second line should be removed.

Point 23: Mr. Ali did not make all the revisions recommended by the examiners. In the initial set of comments that he planned to submit along with his revised thesis, he challenged many of their statements. The tone of his comments was such that the Dean of the FGPS advised Mr. Ali to edit the comments prior to submission. Mr. Ali did so and the final version of the comments was reduced from 117 to 106 pages. Both versions of the comments are included in the set of documents being provided to the Senate Appeals Committee.

Point 45: When Margaret Moriarty, Assistant Dean and Secretary General of the FGPS received Mr. Ali’s appeal documents on 25/03/2013, she immediately printed off the attached “Appeal Letter” and quickly checked that she could open and read the other attachments. In preparing the documentation for the Executive Committee, she was unable to locate that initial e-mail. She asked both Ms. Gervais (who was copied on the e-mail) and Mr. Ali to resend it to her.

Point 48: It is not clear what is meant here by “lack of full disclosure.” It may be mean e-mails that Mr. Ali obtained but that were not in the FGPS file, for example, the e-mail from Dr. Lemaire where he expressed his initial reluctance to read the thesis.

Point 63: The FGPS Executive Committee’s role is to ensure that procedures are followed correctly. The members did not decide to discount some examiners’ views as is suggested here.

Point 64: It is not true that “In the case of the Appellant, a majority of reviewers at no time rendered verdicts of 3 or 4.” The first version of the thesis received one #2 verdict, two #3s and one #4 verdict (three verdicts out of four).

Point 71: It is the University that grants the degree and that undertakes the evaluation of the thesis. The individuals to whom the student sent his thesis were not selected or approved by the University.

Point 80: It is stated here that “At an oral defense stage, the Appellant’s thesis will be tested by appropriately qualified academic experts.” It is unclear who these experts would be, given the

derogatory remarks the student has made about the competence of some of the Examining Board members.

Point 81: Here there is a reference to the “unfortunate level of delays occasioned by the Appellant in his written review process.” It is unclear what is meant here. Does it refer to the extension granted to Mr. Ali for completion of his revisions, or to the extension granted for submission of his appeal to the Executive Committee of the FGPS and for submission of his appeal to the Senate Appeals Committee?

Point 100. Dr. Lamontagne did not “complain” to the Executive Committee members about Mr. Ali. In fact, he just made them aware of Mr. Ali’s posting of his appeal documents on the biomechanics listserv.

Point 101. The e-mails contained in Exhibit A through E of Attachment G 1 were not in the FGPS file. The same is true of many other e-mails included in the “Appeal Submissions.”

Point 138. Dr. Robertson did not insist that Dr. Pierrynowski examine the thesis. It was necessary to find a replacement for Dr. B  no  t. Dr. Pierrynowski had been proposed at the time of initial submission of the thesis. He became a logical choice as a replacement for Dr. B  no  t. Mr. Ali did not object to Dr. Pierrynowski either when he was initially proposed or when he was added. It was only when he received his report that he voiced any criticism.

Point 148. See comment above on Point 80. Here again it is stated that the thesis should go directly to an oral defence without it being clear before whom the thesis would be defended.

Point 149. It is untrue that the examiners were unaware that they were evaluating a revised thesis. When it was realized that they had been given the same form as that used for an original submission, the Dean of the FGPS contacted the examiners. He made clear to them that a student whose thesis is not found acceptable for defence following a second reading must withdraw from the program. Note that Dr. Caldwell then changed his original #3 verdict to a #2 but left his report unchanged. Dr. Lemaire and Dr. Pierrynowski theirs at # 3.

Point 154. There is no evidence that Dr. Pierrynowski **discussed** the thesis with Dr. Robertson prior to writing his report. It is never easy for an examiner to write a negative report. If Dr. Pierrynowski did share his report with Dr. Robertson prior to submitting it to the Dean of the FGPS, it is likely that he simply wanted to spare Dr. Robertson the shock of receiving the report from the Dean of the FGPS.

Point 164 (line 3): TSC should read “Examining Board.”